



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

City of London." It is simply limited to one general class extending over a larger area than London, and a class in which a great interest is developing throughout England, as shown both in its politics and in its philanthropy. It deserves the same attention and study.

J. H. HYSLOP.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

ANIMAL RIGHTS, CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO SOCIAL PROGRESS.

By Henry S. Salt; also an Essay on Vivisection in America, by Albert Leffingwell, M.D. 12mo, pp. 176. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

This little book does not pretend to be a theoretical discussion of animal rights, but only a statement of practical reasons for modifying both our treatment of animals and our habits of using them for food. From the title, one would expect either a theoretical examination of the question whether animals had any rights, or, assuming that in some sense they had them, a practical treatise on methods of preventing cruelty to them. But this does not seem to be the object of the book, even in the essay on vivisection, where their use for scientific purposes under the scalpel and knife, even under anæsthetics, is wholly condemned. Hence higher ground is taken than the mere prevention of needless pain and cruelty. Consequently, the whole problem of using animal food is brought into discussion and vegetarianism seen to be the sequel of it. For this latter purpose, the whole argument in the first chapter pretending to prove animal rights is inadequate, being nothing more than a criticism of the argument against them. No fundamental position, philosophical or theological, is taken as a ground of such rights, and hence we have only an exposure of certain logical weaknesses in the defence of existing practice towards animal life.

In fact, the book confuses three distinct problems which ought to be kept distinct from each other. (1) The abstract question of animal rights of any kind; (2) The question of their treatment as sensible beings, whether we accord them the same rights as man or not; and (3) The question of vegetarianism. The last problem virtually assumes that they have equal rights with man. On the other hand, some can defend animal rights of a certain kind without including a prohibition of animal food. Then, independently of all questions of rights, others may insist on human conduct to-

wards animals upon the ground of man's duty to moral law in general, including good will towards all harmless sentient life. It is noticeable, also, that the force of the authors' argument for the first and third of these problems is obtained almost wholly from the public sympathy already enlisted for the second, but not recognized in any way to be efficient; and at the same time those who do not go the length of vegetarianism may lose interest in the importance of the other matters, because one does not like premises which include such distinct conclusions, when one of them is repugnant to him. Hence we must deplore the discussion of these questions side by side, since it is evidently the purpose to move public sentiment generally. This is not to say that the book is not a valuable one: for we think it is calculated to make many persons think. But whether vegetarianism be correct or not, there is great importance in limiting the wholesale cruelty to animals going on in productive and distributive commerce, in gaming and sport, and in vivisection. Public opinion can best be influenced by stimulating its humanitarianism or sympathies in that direction, and not by recommending consequences which it does not see are the logical outcome of the humane attitude towards animals.

Apart from these considerations, we can commend the book very highly to every one who feels for the dumb brute the regard which a noble man must feel if he makes any pretensions to being moral. The chapter on sport is a good one, and others hardly less so. If the work did not attempt to prove too much, it might be advisedly placed in the hands of every one, for its spirit shows the finest feelings a moral being can possess.

J. H. HYSLOP.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

EDINBURGH SUMMER MEETING. Ninth Session, August 5-31, 1895.

Readers of this JOURNAL may be interested to hear of the continuation of this course, organized by Professor Patrick Geddes. Its aim seems to be that of giving what may be called a concrete education in the subjects of human interest, *i.e.*, an education in which the various subjects are treated in organic relation to one another and not as abstract and independent branches of study. The courses are grouped in the following departments: Social Science and Philosophy; Civics and Hygiene; History, Literature, and Language; Psychology and Education; Biology; Geography and Geology; Chemistry; Sloyd; Fine Art; Musical Recitals; Ex-